

Appln No. 09/692,746
Amdt date April 19, 2005
Reply to Office action of January 19, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for his careful consideration of this application. In response to the above-identified final Office Action, the Applicant seeks reconsideration, re-examination and allowance of the Application. In this response Applicant does not add, amend or cancel any claims. Accordingly claims 1-15 and 19-51 are pending in the Applicant.

Initially, Applicant notes that the Examiner has apparently not returned an initialed copy of Forms PTO/SB/08A/B filed with Applicant's Information Disclosure Statements filed on October 31, 2003, September 27, 2004 and October 7, 2004. If the Examiner requires a further copy of the Information Disclosure Statements, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact Applicant's undersigned counsel of record.

I. Summary of the Interview

Applicant's attorney conducted an interview with the Examiner on April 14, 2005. Applicant's attorney and the Examiner discussed the applicability of U.S. Publication No. 2001/0037320 by Allport to the limitations of claim 1 and the teachings of all of the cited references in regard to dependent claim 2. In regard to independent claim 1, the Examiner acknowledged that Allport does not teach or suggest "a plurality of stateless cryptographic devices remote from the plurality of user terminals and coupled to the computer network" as recited in claim 1. Specifically, the Examiner acknowledged that Allport does not teach a system where a plurality of

Appln No. 09/692,746
Amdt date April 19, 2005
Reply to Office action of January 19, 2005

cryptographic devices are present and a plurality of user terminals are present connected by a network. Thus, the rejection of claim 1 presented in the Office Action mailed January 19, 2005, failed to establish a proper *prima facie* case of obviousness for claim 1.

In regard to dependent claim 2, Examiner conceded that the cited references do not teach the elements of this claim. Specifically, the prior art does not teach cryptographic devices that "include a computer executable code for verifying the advertisement graphic using a DSA algorithm, a public key, and a previously assigned digital signature."

II. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-15 and 19-51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2001/0037320 of Allport et al. (hereinafter "Allport") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,408,286 issued to Heiden (hereinafter "Heiden") and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,424,954 issued to Leon (hereinafter "Leon"). Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw these rejections.

Regarding independent claim 1, as mentioned above in the Interview Summary, the Examiner has acknowledged that the rejection set forth in the Office Action of January 19, 2005 does not provide a proper basis for a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Specifically, Allport does not teach "a plurality of user terminals coupled to a computer network" and "a plurality of stateless cryptographic devices remote from the plurality of user terminals and coupled to the computer

Appln No. 09/692,746

Amdt date April 19, 2005

Reply to Office action of January 19, 2005

network." Independent claim 29 includes elements that are analogous to those discussed in regard to independent claim 1. Specifically, claim 29 includes the elements of "interfacing with one or more users via the client system" and "verifying the digitally signed advertisement graphics using any of a plurality of stateless cryptographic modules." As discussed with the Examiner in regard to independent claim 1, Allport does not teach a plurality of user terminals connected to a network or a plurality of cryptographic modules connected to the network, therefore, Allport cannot teach "interfacing with one or more users via a client system" where "communicating with the client system" is done "over the communication network" for "verifying the digitally signed advertisement graphics using any of a plurality of stateless cryptographic modules," as recited in claim 29. Thus, for the reasons mentioned above in regard to independent claim 1, independent claim 29 is also not properly rejected in the Office Action mailed January 19, 2005.

In regard to dependent claim 2, the Examiner acknowledged in the interview of April 14, 2005 that the elements of this claim are not taught by the cited references. The Examiner acknowledged that Allport, Heiden and Leon do not teach "verifying the advertisement graphics using a DSA algorithm, a public key and a previously assigned digital signature." Thus, Applicant believes that this claim is allowable over the cited references.

In addition, Applicant believes that the cited references fail to teach a system where a cryptographic module verifies an advertisement graphic using any of these methods individually,

Appln No. 09/692,746

Amdt date April 19, 2005

Reply to Office action of January 19, 2005

specifically a DSA algorithm, a public key, or a digital signature. Rather, Heiden teaches a system where coupons are printed on a piece of mail and later validated by a retailer when a user seeks to redeem the coupon. See Heiden, column 10 lines 22-31, "the coupon also includes information that allows the redemption system to authenticate the coupon." See also, column 10 line 43 - column 12 line 15 discussing the redemption system. This redemption system is unrelated to the printing of the advertisement and the value bearing item and is unrelated to a cryptographic module responsible for verifying that an advertisement may be printed on an item with a value bearing indicium. Therefore, the Applicant believes that Heiden also does not teach cryptographic modules that verify an advertising graphic may be printed with a value bearing indicium, as recited in claims 1 and 29. Thus, for this additional reason, Applicant believes that independent claims 1 and 29 are allowable over the prior art.


In regard to claims 3-15, 19-28 and 30-51, these claims depend from independent claims 1 and 29 and incorporate the limitations thereof. Thus, at least for the reasons mentioned above in regard to independent claims 1 and 29, the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for these claims as well. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of these claims are requested.

Appln No. 09/692,746
Amdt date April 19, 2005
Reply to Office action of January 19, 2005

III. Conclusion

Applicant notes that the Examiner has acknowledged that the Office Action of January 19, 2005 did not properly establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for independent claim 1 and Applicant argues that this rationale also applies to independent claim 29. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the finality of the present final Office Action if the Examiner does not allow the claims and offers a new rationale for rejecting the claims, because the Applicant has not amended the claims in this Response to Final Office Action. In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending, namely claims 1-15 and 19-51 patentably define the subject mentioned over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner offers new grounds for rejection of the present claims, Applicant respectfully requests a telephone conference with the Examiner. The Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at (626) 795-9900 to arrange such a teleconference.

Respectfully submitted,
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By 
Jonathan S. Miller
Reg. No. 48,534
626/795-9900

SAH/amb
CAH PAS612180.1-* -04/19/05 1:13 PM